CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXVII No. 6 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* June 1986

DAMAGE, LIMITATION OR SLOW STRANGULATION

by MARIE ENDEAN

"About as solid as a piece of Gruyère cheese" observed one EEC commentator on the Luxembourg packet of institutional reforms agreed by the Heads of Government last December.

Reforms frozen, victory for the minimalists, disappointing new general rules to which everyone would pay lip-service with so many exceptions as to make them largely meaningless. Better than nothing. Such were the first reactions of public figures and the British press to the agreement reached during the European Council's well-publicised stormy deliberations.

For one brief moment Anti-Marketeers could have been forgiven for catching a sigh of relief at the dismay proclaimed so loudly by the Euro-enthusiasts. Had a miraculous check indeed been applied to the momentum towards federal union?

Are there really grounds for such hopes? Precious few, alas.

The deal struck by the Heads of State hinges on an Act of Union, the wording of which was finalised by the Foreign Ministers two weeks after the Summit but the full text of which still remains unpublished. This all-embracing Act (based apparently on the Dooge Report) covers both the proposed revisions of the Treaty of Rome and a new treaty on joint foreign policy and security matters. An umbrella concept, beloved of the French and known as a "chapeau", the Act was strongly favoured by France and Italy because "it implies an advance towards a fully united Europe."[1] So there we have it. Nothing could be plainer.

First, in the interests of creating a single unrestricted market without frontiers, the veto may now be exercised only when vital national interests are threatened. True, member states can apply for exemption to internal market rules but the Commission will agree only on grounds of "major needs" which will have to be explained and argued by the objecting country — with no assurance of ultimate success.

This uncertainty is compounded by many factors, one of which is a shift in the powers of the Assembly. The Assembly certainly has been disappointed in its expectation of gaining full right of co-decision with the Council of Ministers, but, nevertheless, it has made real gains. It has been granted important new delaying powers which put a time limit of three months on final decision reached by the Council. It would appear that, if, on any amendments approved by a majority of Assemblymen, the Council cannot reach a unanimous decision, then the Assembly's will in the matter prevails. An exquisite dilemma for Ministers.

A Force for Radical Change

Important, too, to take into consideration "the leading force for radical change" — the Assembly's Institutional Committee chaired by the ubiquitous veteran Italian Communist, Altiero Spinelli[2]. By withholding its right to give opinions the Assembly can block all action by Ministers and this Comrade Spinelli is determined to do. In his words, "We've got to create a state of institutional crisis."[3]

This will be much more probable now with the entry into the EEC of Spain and Portugal. At a stroke this has tipped the balance away from the so-called Centre-Right to the Left-wing parties who are now only some twenty votes short of an outright majority. As absenteeism during voting in the Assembly is notorious, this leaves the way wide open to the dedicated Left. So, the roseate political complexion of Common Market politics is set to intensify.

Most significantly, the Summiteers agreed on tightening the rules for monetary cooperation, thus ensuring the convergence of economic and monetary policy in the Community. There is to be a wider use of the ECU which has long been groomed for stardom[4]. Thus is being fulfilled one of the chief aims of the EEC: for its currency "to share global management with the United States", the words of M. Jacques Delors, President of the European Commission[5]. Though strong opposition to the idea of Britain's joining the European Monetary Scheme has been registered by the House of Commons all-party Treasury and Civil Service Committee, unless there is a radical change of direction by our Government, this will surely take place. The hums and haws of

some institutional bodies and some newspapers are not echoed by at least one sharp pro-Market business journal which confidently forecasts that the United Kingdom will join the rating mechanism of the EMS this year[6].

Another advance ensured by the Summit will be the "enhanced role" for the European Commission in the implementation of the rules which it lays down. EEC publicists have so far been somewhat coy about unveiling the exact nature of these enhanced powers. No prizes will be awarded for right guesses.

"Of stupefying complexity". That was how *The Times* once described the economic arrangements of the Common Market[7]. Equally stupefying are its political arrangements. Periodic thrusts towards federal union are invariably disguised in a welter of confusion, alarms and retreats, and the bandying-about of misinformation and ambiguities. The Luxembourg Summit has been typical in this respect and much yet remains to be revealed, deciphered and interpreted.

On the evidence we have so far of the agreements reached, we can safely conclude that slow strangulation will continue to be the order of the day.

But all is not lost even at this thirteenth hour. Following the formal signing by the Foreign Ministers on 17th February, the Summit reforms are subject to approval by the national Parliaments of the Community. In due course, then, our own Parliament will have to examine the terms and it will be up to every-one of us to bring pressure to bear on our MPs. The Danish Parliament, alone of the twelve, has already rejected the package and the Danish Prime Minister has arranged to hold a referendum.

There will be no referendum in Britain but at least we have a further short period in which to try to wriggle out of the Common Market stranglehold.

Houdini, please advise!

REFERENCES

1. *The Times,* 17 December, 1985.
2. *Daily Telegraph,* 13 January, 1986.
3. *Ibid.* 20 November, 1985.
4. *The Times,* 8 November, 1984.
5. *Ibid.* 15 January, 1985.
6. *Thames Valley Business,* January, 1986.
7. 29 March, 1985.

With acknowledgement to HOME magazine, Bodifyr, Lonpobty, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 1HT.

FOR FAMILY, COUNTRY AND TRADITION

A new book of the greatest interest and value to Candour readers

When Elizabeth, Lady Freeman, first sent her **TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY** for me to read, she said that it was the collection she had made over the years in her commonplace book, and now the times being what they are, she would like to see it printed "for the sake of her grandchildren".

In an earlier Dark Age, it was the monasteries that held and safeguarded the accumulation of wisdom and truth neglected — if not abhorred — by contemporary marauders. Today, when it appears that Shangri-la exists only in the imagination of James Hilton, everybody's grandchildren will probably have to search for it among the forgotten contents of attics and second-hand book-shops, but with minds loaded with Establishment lies, as to ever greater extent they will be, they will not know what to look for unless provided with a key. This anthology of Elizabeth Freeman's choice is just such a key. It contains a collection of gems so excellent in themselves that they "make hungry where most [they] satisfy."

If the miracle we pray for is delayed, and the spiritual and physical vandalism of nations continues, may our children's children find, learn from and profit by the treasures of truth exemplified in this timely strong-book.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

Prices: £10 (U.K.) $15 (U.S.A.) £12.50 (Rest of the world)

PROSPECT OF EUROPEAN SUPER-STATE

(published in **The Times,** 6th May, 1986)

From Mr. Peter Horsfield, QC, and Mr. Leolin Price, QC.

Sir, There is presently before Parliament a Bill to approve the Single European Act which amends the Treaty of Rome.

For reasons which we find very difficult to understand the signing of the Act itself in February of this year and the passage of the Bill approving the Act have attracted almost no comment and, so far as we are aware, no critical analysis whatsoever.

This is the more extraordinary since the Act plainly involves important constitutional changes and is in terms expressed as a step towards establishing a European political union. The explanation may lie in the success of the Government's attempts to represent the Act as being concerned only with minor matters affecting the freedom of the European internal market and involving no loss of UK sovereignty.

A detailed analysis of the Act would not be possible in this letter. However, the following points may give your readers some idea of the flavour of the Act:

1. The preamble to the Act states that its motivation is to transform relations as a whole among the EEC states "into a European union . . . and to invest this union with the necessary means of action". In short, the Act is in terms of a political union, something which every government (including the present one) has consistently disavowed since the UK first joined the EEC.

2. Article 1 of Title I reaffirms the statement of intent in the preamble by stipulating a common intention to make "concrete progress towards European unity". As a signatory to the Act, one can only assume that (despite its protestations to the contrary) the British Government shares this common intention.

3. The principal mechanisms by which the Act seeks to effect its object are by strengthening the directive powers of the Commission and reducing the role of the national veto. The areas over which the veto is abolished (unanimous decision being replaced by "qualified majority decision") are so extensive that they can fairly be described as embodying virtually the whole of the member nations' social policies: these areas are certainly not limited to matters directly concerned with the freedom of the internal market.

4. The political significance of "qualified majority" voting on these broad and vitally important areas of policy has been noted in the special report on the Act by the Select Committee on European Legislation (printed February 26, 1986). In particular the committee has pointed out that not even two members of the "big four" (France, Germany, Italy and the UK), let alone a single member, would be able to block a Commission proposal and that the new Mediterranean block (whose interests, traditions and culture are profoundly different from ours) would exert a major influence.

Put shortly, if the Act is (as seems likely) approved by Parliament, the greater part of this country's social policy will, in the last analysis, be in the hands of the Commission subject to the majority votes of other states. Perhaps even more importantly, the green light will have been formally given to the creation of a European super-state.

More generally, our concern is that the processes by which, in the EEC, governmental powers are exercised and new EEC law is proposed and enacted are quite unlike that responsible "government in Parliament" which has been developed at Westminster and is part of our heritage and our instincts.

We are being eased, by stealth, towards something quite different: where more and more governmental power is to be exercised, away from Westminster, by institutions which do not derive from our constitutional traditions and which are, in our terms, constitutionally irresponsible.

Without deliberate and elaborate explanation and public discussion this remarkable change in our constitutional arrangements cannot be said to command our informed national consent.

Yours faithfully,

PETER HORSFIELD,
LEOLIN PRICE,
8 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, WC2.

TREASON!

SAVE OUR COUNTRY FROM EUROPEAN SLAVERY

Alert the public to the fact that supporting European Union is treason.

Send for our special poster.

Only £1 for 20 from
CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

GIVE BACK THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE

by NOEL HUNT

The recent debates on the frightening rise in crime, particularly in violent crime, the widespread alarm expressed, and the solution proposed should have made one thing quite clear: that the average man is powerless to carry his point unless it is approved by the unseen censors behind the scene. This state of affairs has long been apparent to the reflective. It will now be clear, one hopes, to a great many more.

Every working politician knows perfectly well that the majority of the electorate would willingly see Britain out of the Common Market. We know, too, that they would probably and even more sensibly like to see her out of the United Nations. Politicians of all parties would agree, if they could be induced to discuss the matter at all, that most Englishmen are totally opposed to a multi-racial society here. They know too that the bulk of the electorate would support the sternest measures against the thug and the bully-boy. Yet there is seldom a hint that such views even exist, still less that they are commonplace.

Popular wisdom runs that in a "democracy", that is to say a state such as Britain in which practically everyone but a criminal lunatic has a vote, the popular will prevails. This is, of course, utter nonsense. If the popular will prevailed Britain would leave the Common Market and the United Nations. Yet which of the major political parties would sponsor a Parliamentary candidate who used this as a plank in his platform? Any attempt to suggest that there might be merit in ceasing to be a multi-racial society, or that it might be worth considering the return of the birch and the gallows is either ignored, treated with amused and condescending disdain, or smothered under clouds of abuse and character-smearing. Certainly no major political party has yet nominated a candidate professing these views. This is odd, since in theory Parliament exists to give effect to the majority will. This is not to say that any of the points of view set out above are necessarily either right or wrong. The point is that there seems to be tacit agreement among those who rule our rulers that the subjects mentioned shall so far as possible never be mentioned, let alone discussed freely and fully.

A recent Gallup Poll tells us that 76% of the public feel that Court sentences are too short. It is hard to think of a more complete vote of no confidence. Over half the electorate think that corporal punishment should be brought back. This percentage is surprisingly high, since many must be products of the Permissive Society, and thus can have no personal knowledge of the deterrent effect of the birch. It proves that in spite of years of liberal brain-washing and social science codswallop the average man still knows instinctively that force alone will keep the bully in check.

Public Nuisances

Britain has always had her share of these public nuisances. They were kept in check in the past by the birch, the lash and where necessary the gallows. These measures worked reasonably well until we allowed ourselves to be cozened by the social scientist into believing, like the Marxist-Leninist, that man is basically good, made bad only by his environment. Since huge efforts were made and enormous sums of money were spent to improve the environment it was argued that man had changed for the better. The stern measures of the past were therefore no longer necessary. Accordingly corporal punishment, which had been found necessary by every society of which History has a mention, was abolished. This was folly enough, one would have thought.

But we went further. We set up a Welfare State. This has the effect, always and everywhere, of ensuring that the least desirable elements of the population breed fastest. There is no population explosion among the intelligent. Further, subsidised medical and welfare services ensure that most of those born survive and are encouraged to breed. Population, particularly the least desirable elements, in obedience to Malthus' Law, grows geometrically. Thus we have more thugs per thousand than we had before. While the number of the violent was increasing the pressure for fewer Police, fewer Courts and more lenient sentences was urged ever more vigorously by the "caring" professions; they know a good thing when they see one.

The argument ran, and still runs, that because the environment has been vastly improved man must have "progressed" and "advanced". This being the case, it was argued that corporal punishment was no longer necessary.

The truth is, of course, that with checks on death removed and with breeding subsidised what our society needs is not fewer Police but more, not fewer Courts but more, not leniency but sterner measures

to repress the violent product of the Permissive Society.

It is fashionable to hold that everyone everywhere acquires, simply by being born, an impressive array of rights. Birth does not, it seems, impose anything so burdensome as a responsibility to balance every right. Logically this should be the case, of course, but this awkward point is always left discreetly vague.

Yet one right seems to have been with-held from the thug, the mugger and the sadist. That is the right to choose. The thug charged with a brutal assault can be sure that he will be treated "sensitively" by "a caring and compassionate society". He is sure of being dealt with by workers each of whom has a "social conscience" and "concern". At every stage he will be treated with "understanding". If convicted he will receive a sentence which, as noted above, 76% of the population feel is too lenient. He will serve his sentence in a prison probably at least as comfortable as the home from which he came.

This has been going on for nearly two generations. The results of such folly are to be seen all round us.

It is suggested that we might do much to right matters quite quickly by making it necessary for anyone intending to use violence to stop and think first, to make a choice before acting.

This right of choice can be conferred on the thug simply by laying it down as a matter of policy that in all cases — repeat, in all cases— where violence is used, the user will in turn suffer violence. This, of course, in addition to any other penalty which the Courts may impose.

The knowledge that violence would inevitably on conviction lead to the birch or the lash would tend to restrain the bully. In the past it always did to an acceptable extent, and there is no reason why it should not again. Any magistrate or judge whose conscience will not allow him to order corporal punishment has his remedy: he can resign. "Caring", "compassion" and "understanding" run riot have merely made our streets unsafe and our thugs ever more insolent and more brutal. We should lose nothing by trying the experiment. All that is required is the repeal of the act abrogating corporal punishment; and, of course, the resolution to repeal it.

Another right which might well be strictly enforced is the right of the victim to compensation. Here again, it would be simple enough to ensure that as a matter of course, and after conviction but before he leaves the dock, the criminal should be ordered to pay compensation to his victim. It cannot be held that the criminal cannot pay. In the welfare state everyone is entitled to the dole. A garnishee on these payments, strictly enforced, would be a weekly reminder to the thug and his family that violence does not pay.

If these suggestions were ever seriously mooted — as they will not be because no politician would have the courage to do so — we should have the usual specious argument that by enforcing compensation society is penalising the innocent in the shape of his pregnant wife, his conveniently handicapped children and his aged parents. This is not true, of course. It is not society which causes the thug's dole payments to be reduced. It is his own action in using violence on his fellow man. He exercised his right of choice and this is the result.

Need To Muzzle The Violent

In America after the Civil War the frequent assaults on white women and children by freed slaves led to the formation of the Ku Klux Klan. In three months it restored public order in the South. In other parts of the world the breakdown of public order has led to the emergence of vigilante groups. Nobody would wish to see such things happening here. Yet history seems to show that this is what the future holds for Britain unless an effective means of muzzling the violent is found.

Today in America, where softness in dealing with the criminal is even more of a cult than it is here, the shape of the future is now emerging. It is the fortified community. In Europe the widespread violence and brigandage which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire led to the walled city and eventually to the feudal system. In the States today the same intolerable level of public violence has led to the Planned Unit Development. This is an innocuous phrase to describe a carefully controlled and restricted private community, complete with closed-circuit T.V. surveillance, armed guards and anti-intrusion devices. Millions of Americans have chosen to live in these planned units or in condominiums because they offer a strictly controlled and above all a safe environment. It seems certain that it is only a question of time before Britain has similar communities established for similar reasons: a squeamish reluctance to fight violence with violence.

As usual, the choice is not between good and bad but between bad and worse. It may be bad that the thug should be beaten and forced to pay compensation for his use of violence. Yet it is surely worse that vigilantes, lynch law and fortified communities should appear in Britain. It seems that unless we

bestir ourselves and bring the thug under control a home of your own will no longer be a pleasant detached bungalow but a fortified bunker in a maximum security condominium or Planned Development Unit. The wheel will thus come full circle as our society returns to the fortified city from which it emerged long ago.

Support RECAP — the Campaign for the Return of Capital Punishment. Send 2 12p stamps to RECAP, 84 Ditton Walk, Cambridge CB5 9QE.

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send 63p for a sample copy to:
P.O. BOX 446, LONDON SE23 2LS.

"THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO NOT KNOW"

News stories appear daily of the atrocities committed by an arrogant criminal element. However, if some interests have their way, certain facts on crime will be concealed.

Two reports in **The Times** on May 9th told of Press Council rulings against the **Daily Telegraph** and the **Daily Express** for introducing descriptions of race into a number of court reports. The Press Council was acting in both cases on complaints brought by a Mr. R. Borzello of Camden Passage, north London, who considered it "improper, prejudicial and pejorative" against black defendants to cite their colour in various rape cases. Borzello was particularly incensed at an **Express** report that "laughing, sniggering blacks fought over the whimpering girls like animals" in the notorious Brixton multiple-rape case.

Does Borzello contest the **truth** of that statement? If so, he must know something the jury, who convicted them, did not. Or does the fact he makes such complaints to the sympathetic-minded watchdogs of the 'liberal' press with irritating regularity, suggest that, in Belloc's words, he would rather "there are things that people do not know . . . because they are not told"?

WHY GADDAFI IS ON THE HIT LIST

by DON BELL

There can be no doubt that the Nations of the West are out to "get Gaddafi." At America's prompting, Great Britain has deported Libyans who were called security risks. The European Community has condemned Libya. Nato Nations are cutting down on the number of people permitted to remain in embassies and legations. Even the Greek government, angered because of the loss in tourist trade, spoke out against Gaddafi. In retaliation, the Libyan government ordered all foreign correspondents out of the country. Step by step, the prospects of yet another in the succession of contained and limited wars develop. As the man said, "When this country (meaning its elitist governors) has gotten into a real jam, war has happened. In line with this thought, the current **US News** cover story (4/28/86) is headlined: **"America's New War. Can it be won? At what price?"**

There is no question but that the Nations of the West, with the US leading the parade, has been out to "get Gaddifi". When so many other nations (and their leaders) have been directly involved in terrorist activities — Iran, Syria, North Korea, Yemen, Cuba, Nicaragua, East Germany, USSR, Bulgaria and the other Warsaw Pact affiliated* — with so many bedfellows why should Libya be singled out for attack and potential war? And just how do the World Bankers fit into this picture? And does the drop in oil prices have anything to do with it? These are questions that need to be answered. Patrick Henry told the Virginia Convention in 1775: "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past." Since our future is directly involved, let's follow the example set by one of America's greatest Christian Patriots.

In **Wealth For All,** published in 1982, R. E. McMaster, Jr, asked, "What's **Big Oil** doing around the rest of the world? Let's take Libya for example . . . Despite all the recent furor over possible assassination teams in the United States, it is noteworthy that the United States purchased about two-thirds of Libya's oil production in 1981. Libya, in fact, was the US' third largest foreign supplier . . . US multinational oil interests in Angola provide

another fascinating study of the conflict between national political and international economic interests. In early 1981, thanks primarily to Gulf Oil, the US taxpayer-funded Export-Import Bank, along with the old multinational reliable, Morgan Guaranty Trust, made communist Angola a major loan. The ultimate in hypocrisy and multinational oil company greed was realized when Cuban troops were ordered to protect these American oil interests in communist Angola. *Big Bucks, Big Banks and Big Oil* are all involved . . ."

In **The Money Lenders** Anthony Sampson noted that "The big American banks had long been interlocked with oil money . . . But neither the Chase nor the other big banks were prepared for what happened in 1973 . . . The price of oil was first doubled in October 1973 and two months later doubled again." Something new and unexpected had happened and the Big Bankers had to learn to cope, or go bankrupt. But the Arabs had no love for the debt-money system that was employed by the Big Banks. Said Sampson: "They (the Arabs) were still inhibited, like European moneylenders in the middle ages, by the religious objections to usury . . . The Koran forbade the practice of *riba,* or usury." So does the Holy Bible, which Christians revere in most other respects, but long ago turned their minds away from the fact that taking or giving interest on money is sinful. Sampson explains that with the Moslems "the usury laws could be overcome by regarding interest as commission or service charges, but they held back the development of banking through the Arab world; less than four percent of Arabs made use of any kind of financial institution. And in Saudi Arabia much of the wealth resided in the personal fortunes of the royal family, which remained wrapped in secrecy."

And that's when a young Lieutenant, now a Colonel, came into international prominence. Muammar Gaddafi would have nothing to do with the fractional reserve bankers who charged and collected interest on loans. Usury is forbidden by the Muslim's bible, the Koran, even as it is forbidden in the Christian's Holy Bible. But with the Renaissance came the International Bankers who made loans to governments instead of individuals, and charged interest on their loans. However, to the world of Islam before the oil boom came, fractional reserve banking was unknown and a real shock. Gaddafi, a man with a dream similar to that of Khomeini of Iran, wanted to build an Empire, one in which usury and fractional reserve banking would be forbidden. So, Gaddafi would have nothing to do with Western Bankers, kicked them out, and started doing business with the USSR. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the other oil producing countries of the Middle East also had the problem of usury to deal with. But they managed to get around many of the religious restrictions by buying properties and industries in the United States and other Western countries. This conflict between Arab and Western money systems is a matter that deserves deep study. But suffice it to say that presently, Gaddafi's dream of Empire is in direct opposition to the Empire of *The New World Order* which the owners and controllers of the Federal Reserve Banks and other Central Banks, are intent on foisting upon us with the dawning of the 21st century.

This conflict in banking systems and control of loot is, at least in great part, the reason all the fire and fury over terrorism is aimed at Gaddifi and Libya, while other countries involved in the spread of terrorism are tolerated, or even ignored.

* To say nothing of the U.S.A.-cosetted thugs operating in Northern and Southern Ireland. Ed.

FIE, FIE, DEMOCRACY!

Is this the Iron Lady
Or puppet moved by strings
To postures snide and shady
And parts for underlings?
Not to hold the dagger
When murder is to start
But polish it with vigour,
To play the "second's" part.
A puppet-master signals
For anti-terror show;
And fearfully the bomb falls
Where children play below.
Salute the Double Standard,
Find acquiescent priest,
Forget of terror's vanguard
About the Middle East. B. E. BIGGS.

We have no less an authority than Menachem Begin as to who constitutes "terror's vanguard" in the Middle East. In the 1950s, Begin boasted that had it not been for his feat at Deir Yassin, where 300 unarmed Arab men, women and children were slaughtered, there would never have been the vast stampede of terror-stricken refugees which enabled Arab lands, homesteads and possessions to be stolen. At the same time, Begin and his henchmen turned upon their British military benefactors all the terrorist weapons and methods their ghastly minds could concoct. The impudence of the Israelis, Reagan and Thatcher in complaining about barbarism in those whom Zionists have so grievously wronged has, to use Flecker's words, "a monstrous beauty". They would do well to pipe down.

A LAMENTABLE LITTLE MAN

It would be churlish, perhaps, to condemn the late Emmanuel Shinwell out of hand in view of his trenchant anti-Common Market speeches in recent years. Yet to spare more than a word of appreciation for the man calls for rather more conviction than **Candour** can muster. The idea of Shinwell as the champion of British national interests cannot with honesty be described as one to set patriotic hearts on fire. There was a time when this belated defendant of sovereignty wrote treatises explaining to potential Red revolutionaries how they were to dispose of the Army in the event of civil war breaking out among the British people. Was this his return for the hospitality extended to his family when they arrived here from Poland?

Older **Candour** readers probably recall the occasion in the House of Commons when Shinwell boxed Commander Bower's ear. He happened to catch from the exasperated Commander a murmur which enjoined him to "Go back to Poland" — no dire insult to any man who has a proper attitude towards the land of his fathers. Shinwell crossed the floor of the House and struck him in the face. The victim of the assault, once a champion heavyweight boxer, could have knocked down his assailant without rising from his seat, but he preferred to treat the affair with silent contempt, which only encouraged Shinwell to brag afterwards of his own "heroism" on that unsavoury occasion.

After the war, while assuring audiences he was "as British and democratic" as they were, he didn't hesitate to proclaim that he and his fellow-Socialists were "favourably disposed towards Russia" and "sympathetic to Soviet ideals". He went on to plead with people to "trust Stalin". Not surprisingly, this lamentable little man had a succession of failures as Minister of Fuel, leading Attlee to dump him in the War Office, where he displayed a scornful indifference to the superb traditions of the British Army.

An arrant hunter after personal popularity, Emmanuel Shinwell was adept in the least of all the arts — that of ingratiating himself with the mob. Only a nation without a proper sense of pride could continue to bring itself to applaud so egregious a political performer.

A MINE OF INFORMATION — You will never find anything of greater worth than vintage Candours. Now is the time to build your collection of past issues. Original copies from the 1950s and 1960s at 30p each or five for £1. Obtainable from Candour Publishing Co.

SAVAGE NEW WORLD

According to **New Society** of May 9th, some scientists believe it will be possible for *men* to give birth to babies in the "foreseeable future". The procedure would involve fertilising the egg outside the body and placing the resultant embryo in the area of the bowel wall, where it might receive sufficient nourishment to grow. The man would be treated with hormones and the birth would be by caesarian section. Cases where such a pregnancy "would be desirable" might include men married to incurably fertile women, women whose lives would be endangered through pregnancy *or homosexuals.* Meanwhile, countless thousands of naturally-born babies are sacrificed each year to the abortionist's knife. Indeed, our chastisement will be severe.

A. K. SPEAKS

A C.60 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton speaking on the menace of International Finance.

Introduced by Leslie Greene

PRICE £3.00 (£5.00 Overseas)

Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K.	£5.00
Overseas airmail	£6.00
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

SOUTH AFRICANS PLEASE NOTE — Since the rand has been so disastrously devalued, CANDOUR would like to help all unenlightened South Africans to know WHY.

To this end we offer a 1986 limited concession to all new subscribers denizened in South Africa.

Join our readership NOW for the cut price of the rand equivalent of £2.

Apply at once to:
Mrs. Pamela Hickman, 34 Zareba Street, Port Elizabeth 6001 or to
Veritas Bookshop, PO Box 2052, Pretoria 0001.

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.